



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a vocabulary of 500 words in the first year is no easy undertaking, and that such a vocabulary should be largely made up of words that will be useful in the subsequent reading of Latin authors. Now, as has already been noted, the vocabularies in Junior Latin are to be commended for their unity and intrinsic interest. But do they meet the test of a satisfactory first-year vocabulary, as stated above? Hardly. The vocabularies in the latter half of the book, constituting two-thirds of the words to be learned by the pupil, range from twenty to fifty words apiece, and contain a large proportion of words that are rarely, if ever, met in Caesar, Cicero or Vergil. By actual count 53 and 57 per cent of the words found in the vocabularies and declensions of Junior Latin (exclusive of those in the sentences) are not to be found even in the *general* vocabulary of two of the most widely used Beginners' Books, although neither of these pretends to hold to exclusively Caesarian words.

Again, the presentation of paradigms of such rare nouns as *mel*, *sil*, *vās*, and *far*, followed by lists of similarly declined nouns, among which occur *fel*, *ador*, *iecur*, *sulfur*, etc., is absolutely unjustifiable from the point of view of their subsequent usefulness in High School Latin, and is likewise a waste of time.

The same general tendency is seen in the printing of the vocative, whenever possible, in the paradigms. This practice—unfortunately adopted as a rule in our Grammars—is sure to get teacher and pupil into trying situations in the declension of many words. But it is particularly awkward in the paradigms called for in Junior Latin, where the conscientious pupil will find himself ejaculating, 'O horned goat! O liver! O honey! O noses!', etc. In view of the obvious unsuitableness of the vocative in the declension of innumerable nouns it would seem to be the simpler and saner course to state the rule concerning it, and then to emphasize the single exception by presenting it in the paradigm of second declension nouns in *-us*. This and an occasional review of the point is all that is necessary to fix it indelibly in the pupil's mind. To do anything more is to overwork the case to no purpose. It certainly should have small place in a book that lays claim to "labor-saving arrangements".

(2) A second questionable point presents itself in connection with the editors' exclusive use of the isolated sentence. As soon as it is practicable, most Beginners' Books not only illustrate the grammatical points to be emphasized in each lesson by short sentences, but exemplify them in some connected story, thereby adding to the pupil's interest and making him feel that he is actually reading a language. Rejecting this plan, the editors of Junior Latin employ only the isolated sentence, though they seek to secure interest by centering the thought of the sentences in some general topic and by citing appropriate proverbs and quotations from classic authors. In carrying out this idea they apparently forget that the interest of a quotation lies, not in the statement of a fact, but in the context that it suggests. For example, the quotation, *Sudor fluit undique rivis*, immediately brings to the teacher's mind Vergil's incomparable description of the thrilling boat race in the Aeneid. To the pupil, however, who knows nothing of the story, there is no appeal whatever in the sentence that he mechanically translates, 'Sweat flows in streams on all sides'. On the other hand, the reading of a story, however simple, is sure to rouse the curiosity and to stimulate the interest of the pupil.

Here also the unfortunate limitations of ordinary teachers must be taken into account. A brilliant teacher may breathe life into the dry bones of even wholly unrelated sentences. One might easily imagine a class of little folk sitting enthralled before some scholarly

Latinist, while he draws upon his stores of classic lore and entertains them with illuminating comments on the quotations that they translate. But what of the average teacher, whose acquaintance with Latin is all too narrowly circumscribed by the few authors that are usually studied in School and College? To such an one quotations from Ennius, Persius, Petronius, Laevius, Vitruvius, etc., are as cryptic as if they were culled from the Hindu Vedas. And yet it is the average teacher that must ultimately do the bulk of the teaching of any book.

These two points, then—disregard of loss of time and failure to employ any connected prose—stamp Junior Latin as decidedly reactionary. It is highly suggestive of days gone by, when the first year in Latin was devoted to the whole of Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar—paradigms, rules, examples, and exceptions, with no end of analysis and parsing besides. There can be no question of the thoroughness or effectiveness of this old-time method. But it is exceedingly doubtful if the present generation, nurtured as it is on predigested foods, can stomach any such *durum pabulum*.

It may be claimed, however, that these two points are negligible factors in a book that is designed for young pupils, and that in any case they are outweighed by obvious merits in many other respects. This is a question that the practical teacher must decide for himself. Certain it is that in Junior Latin the editors have issued a book that displays unusual originality in its methods, and suggests much that is stimulative of thought on matters pertaining to the successful teaching of First Year Latin.

THE ALBANY ACADEMY.

JARED W. SCUDDER.

THE PROMETHEUS AND THE ION

The Prometheus of Aeschylus and the Ion of Euripides have one important characteristic in common—the central point of each drama is the attack on a deity. Zeus in the earlier play and Apollo in the later are pilloried unmercifully and are presented to the audience in a most displeasing light. In the case of Euripides, we are perhaps not surprised, but Aeschylus is usually considered a pillar of orthodoxy. Of course the defence can always be raised that in the later plays of the Prometheus trilogy Zeus and Prometheus were reconciled and that the justice of the king of the gods was finally proclaimed. Yet we must remember that in a weak and unconvincing way Apollo is justified in the Ion.

What is the vital difference between the plays? The ingenuity expended by Verrall (Euripides the Rationalist, 138 ff.) to prove that Apollo is a fraud and nonexistent and that the whole fiction of the god's interposition is the creation of a corrupt priesthood is unnecessary. Euripides almost certainly conceived of Apollo, as far as the play was concerned, as a real deity, and the legend should be accepted as it stands. With this conceded, let us try to discover some of the factors which make the Prometheus less blasphemous and less religiously demoralizing than the Ion, despite the fact that the attacks on the god are, if anything, more bitter.

The first and perhaps the greatest difference is due to the character of the god's antagonist. The Prometheus is constructed on a grand scale and the hero is himself a god of no small power. The deity of the Titan Prometheus is never forgotten. He, himself, proudly declares it (92): 'See what I, a god, suffer at the hands of the gods'. He is immortal: 'Why should I fear, when I am not fated to die' (see 933). It was by his counsels that Zeus had been able to over-

come Cronus and to seat himself on the throne (221 f.). Nevertheless, with base ingratitude Zeus condemned him for saving humanity by conferring upon the wretched mortals the gift of fire. The god was bound to a lonely crag by the unwilling Hephaestus (14 ff.) and by the brutal Kratos and Bia. He enumerates all the blessings which he has conferred upon mortals (440 ff.) and he is not slow to express his sense of their importance, although, while he is bound, he maintains a stoical silence.

In the Ion Creusa is the chief rival of the god of the silver bow. She has been betrayed by the god, and not merely has he never appeared to her again, but she has been able to learn nothing about the fate of her child, who disappeared from the cave on the Acropolis. The god is cruel and heartless, and, even if the audience had been filled with hate for the torturer of Prometheus, they would feel for Apollo not so much hate as absolute and unmitigated contempt.

Is not Io a fitter object of comparison with Creusa? It is true that she must suffer many woes as a result of the love of Zeus, but from Prometheus she learns that she has a more happy future in store for her and it is her descendant who is to free the fettered Titan (772).

The place in which the action of the Prometheus occurs should also be noted. The Ion is localized in Delphi; in the parodos the chorus describes a temple which was of the type found in that sacred spot in the fifth century. This and many other anachronisms have a tendency to make the play a drama of intrigue in contemporary Athens. The Prometheus is supposed to represent remote and long past ages and the scene is laid far to the north, beyond the bounds of the inhabited world, in the wilds of Scythia. The wanderings of Io commence in Greece and end in Egypt (823 ff.), but the unhappy maiden rushes through barbarous and unknown lands, through tribes which seemed to the Greeks the very incarnations of wildness and lack of civilization, through Scythians and Amazons, through the Caucasus, then as now a land of mystery. Never for an instant are we allowed to see in Io an ordinary Greek girl, the victim of a cowardly and ungentlemanly adventurer.

Again, it may be said in defense of Zeus that he is a new ruler. This is definitely stated by Oceanus (312) 'There is a new ruler for the gods'. Among other passages which express the same idea are 96, 955 ff. Perhaps one result of this insistence upon the fact that Zeus was a new ruler would be a feeling in many of the audience that in the course of time Zeus would become a milder and less stern ruler. We must also remember that Prometheus himself confesses that he sinned in giving fire to mortals (268): 'I sinned willingly, willingly, I will not deny it'. Furthermore, Prometheus refuses to submit and he deliberately insults Oceanus when the latter urges the suffering rebel to submit (332 ff.). Even if we make all allowances for the effect of such obstinacy in showing to the Greeks the guilt of Prometheus, we cannot fail to realize that the sympathies of all are with the Titan rather than with his oppressor and persecutor.

In both plays the chorus sympathizes with the victim of the god's brutality. Thus the chorus in the Ion says, when Xuthus thinks that he has found his son (832-835), 'Alas, how I always loathe wicked men who do injustice and adorn their path with wiles. I should prefer as a friend an unimportant but good man rather than an evil man who is far wiser'. In the Prometheus the decision of the chorus not to forsake their friend but to be plunged with him into the abyss (1067 ff.) and their general attitude of sympathy throw into bolder relief the injustice of Zeus.

When Apollo wronged Creusa, he was sinning against a being who was far inferior in rank to himself. She had no way of compelling him to atone for the evil which he had done her. The most which she could hope for was the destruction of the young man whose appearance had blasted all her dreams and plans of future happiness. Yet this revenge, mean and small as it was, involved her in a repulsive crime. Prometheus submits to the injustice of Zeus, but he finds a grim joy in the thought that he will survive every torture which Zeus can inflict and at the end will see his tormentor laid prostrate himself before one who shall be even mightier than the proud ruler of the gods. As Zeus deposed his father and cast him into Tartarus, so Zeus himself is destined to fall before a still more powerful son, unless he can learn from the despised rebel on the Scythian crag the way in which he can escape this doom. Again and again Prometheus utters these threats, in ever more insolent and haughty language, until Zeus interferes to compel silence (518 ff., 756, 907 ff.).

Akin to this is the difference in the response evoked by the different characters. Creusa wishes to find her child. She has gone to Delphi for this purpose (334 ff.); and she immediately leaves the altar at which she has taken refuge, when she catches sight of the tokens produced by the priestess (1395 ff.). Prometheus maintains throughout his attitude of proud defiance. He insults Hermes, the lackey of the new gods, abuses him, and is totally unmoved either by entreaties or by threats (941 ff.). He and Zeus are open and avowed enemies and in such a duel to the death the savage vengeance of the stronger party is less contemptible than is the cool villainy of an ordinary intriguer.

In neither play does the god appear to face his accuser. In the Ion Apollo sends Athena to explain what has really happened. When she appears, she announces (1556 ff.): 'I, Pallas, who have given my name to your land, I have come in haste from Apollo. He did not wish to come himself to see you, lest he should receive censure for what has happened, but he sent me to tell you what he wished to say'.

In the Prometheus the gods do not display such tenderness of feelings and such desire to avoid hearing reproaches. Hermes enters with a contemptuous speech to the Titan (944 ff.): 'You sophist, you bitterly over-bitter being, who sinned against the gods by giving honors unto mortals, you stealer of fire, I mean, my father has ordered you to tell about that marriage of which you are boasting, as a result of which he is to be hurled from power; tell this clearly and do not speak in riddles; do not make me take a second trip, Prometheus; you see that Zeus is not softened by such words'. There is no need of hesitation in this scene. The battle is joined. Prometheus is waiting for his revenge. Zeus does not deign to come; a messenger will do to carry his orders to this despised criminal in the northern wilds. Apollo is afraid to appear and he sends Athena to ward off well deserved reproaches. His action throughout is contemptible and his statement that Ion is the son of Xuthus is absolutely untruthful. This does not increase the esteem in which the god would be held by the audience.

Furthermore, the introduction of philosophy and of moralizing by Euripides in the Ion helps to condemn the god. Thus Ion says (440 ff.): 'Whoever of mortals is evil, the gods punish. How, then, is it right that you who have written the laws for mortals should yourselves be found guilty of disobeying the laws? But if—it will not be so, but I will use the argument—if, you and Poseidon and father Zeus who

rules the heavens, you will not pay the penalty for your forcible marriages with human beings, you will in atoning for them empty your temples'. Ion practically denies either the truth of the stories or the existence of the gods, both here and in other passages, as in 1523 ff. Prometheus never hesitates. Zeus is god, even while he is unjust.

It is very probable that Aeschylus intended that both Zeus and Prometheus should develop and learn, the one justice, the other wisdom, by experience (Sheppard, *Greek Tragedy*, 63 f.). The Prometheus is a play of open defiance and of a conflict of titanic forces. The Ion is a drama of deceit and of intrigue neither attractive nor honorable. It is true that, when the audience had witnessed the conclusion of the Prometheus trilogy, they would see the reconciliation of the two protagonists. The Ion would close with a revelation of the cowardice of Apollo. The difference lies far deeper. Apollo is presented by Euripides as at heart a coward, a fool, and a bully. Zeus may be unjust and has vanquished in an evil struggle a fellow god for being the benefactor of humanity; still, he won not by treachery, but by the exercise of his power, and he must face the danger of being dethroned. There is a grandeur about his character, even where we would the most willingly condemn. The Ion, which exposes the myth, would destroy the faith of the people in Apollo. The Prometheus by its grandeur and massiveness would earn respect and admiration for Zeus, even while it called attention to his injustice, and we can easily imagine that the trilogy ended in a glorification of Zeus, although we can scarcely imagine the way in which it can be brought about. The important thing is that the Prometheus does not leave us with a spirit of contempt for Zeus, as the Ion affects us with regard to Apollo. In this very vital difference, we have reflected the dissimilarity in the characters of the authors, Euripides the radical thinker and realist, Aeschylus, the soldier poet and a pious and sincerely religious man.

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 138th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia—the final one for the current academic year—was held on Friday, April 5. The meeting was preceded by a dinner to the guest of honor, Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania. Thirty-five members and guests were present. Mr. Thomas W. Pierce was elected President for the ensuing year, and Professor Richard M. Gummere Vice-President. Seven members of the Club have entered the military or the naval service of the United States.

Dr. Jastrow read a really remarkable paper, which was pronounced by a prominent member of the Club, during the discussion, to be "of greater permanent value than any other contribution ever given before the Club". The subject was *New Lamps for Old*; and the paper was a brilliant discussion of the inroads made by the experimental sciences upon the humanities in the new curriculum. Dr. Jastrow traced the decline of the humanities to the decline of speculative philosophy, and assigned that decline to the influence of the Critique of Pure Reason. He then proceeded to show the absolute materialism of the attitude toward life engendered by exclusive devotion to the

experimental sciences, and traced the cause of the present world-war to the spirit thus produced. His prediction was that the world, weary of war, will realize this and turn again—not absolutely from the experimental sciences, but toward the humanities as bestowing the perfect flavor and higher atmosphere of the true life.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*.

THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB

The regular spring meeting of The New York Classical Club was held in Students Hall, Barnard College, on Saturday, April 27. The eighteenth annual business meeting preceded the address of the day. The treasurer, Dr. Tibbetts, presented his report, showing that the total funds of the Club amount to nearly nine thousand dollars, including the Latin and Greek Scholarship funds, the newly authorized Endowment Fund (composed of payments received for life memberships in the Club), and the regular current funds in the treasury. The membership of the Club is now considerably over five hundred. Dr. Harter, chairman of the committee on the award of scholarships, reported the plan of the committee for the coming year—a Latin scholarship of one hundred and fifty dollars to be awarded at the end of each half year after a special competitive examination, and a Greek scholarship of half this amount, also to be awarded semiannually. These take the place of the former annual awards upon the basis of the Regents' examinations.

The present officers of the Club, upon nomination by a committee of which Professor Lodge was chairman, were reelected for the next year, with the exception of the treasurer, Dr. Tibbetts, who in deference to his own wish, was permitted to retire from the office which he has filled so well for the past ten years. A new policy was inaugurated, of combining the functions of the secretary and the treasurer, by electing one person to both offices. Upon the motion of Professor Lodge, Dr. Tibbetts was elected as an additional trustee of the scholarship funds of the Club.

An amendment to the By-Laws was passed, making the terms of the officers of the Club coincide with the fiscal year, which ends on June 30.

The principal address of the meeting was by President M. Carey Thomas of Bryn Mawr College. Her subject, the reverse of its statement in the printed announcements, was *Old Fashioned Education, or Old Wine in New Bottles*, upon which, in terms alive to the conditions imposed by the war upon all educational discussion, Miss Thomas gave a vigorous presentation of the fundamental distinctions in educational values, and testified to the superiority of the humanities as against the substitutes urged by the "insurgents" of the day. President Thomas's address will be more fully presented in an early number of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY next autumn.

At the luncheon which followed, at which 126 members and guests sat down—an unusually large number for the spring meeting—the address was ably discussed by Dr. Caroline Ruutz-Rees, Head Mistress of Rosemary Hall, Dr. John H. Denbigh, Principal of the Morris High School, and Professor Knapp upon whose motion there was an unanimous vote of thanks to Miss Thomas.

A. P. BALL, *Censor*.